

## **APPENDIX F**

# MCCWA Land Management Plan California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Checklist



## California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Checklist

1.	<b>Project title:</b> <u>Mouth of Cottonwood Creek Wildlife Area Land Management Plan</u>
2.	<b>Lead agency name and address:</b> California Department of Fish and Game, Northern Region 601 Locust Street, Redding, California 96001
3.	<b>Contact person and phone number:</b> Jim Chakarun, Wildlife Habitat Supervisor II (530) 527-8917
4.	<b>Project location:</b> The Mouth of Cottonwood Creek Wildlife Area (MCCWA) is located approximately five miles east of the town of Cottonwood, in Shasta County, California. Totaling approximately 1059 acres, the MCCWA has three units: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 571-acre Cottonwood Creek Unit (CCU) is located north of the Shasta Tehama county line at the confluence of Cottonwood Creek and the Sacramento River.</li> <li>• The 348-acre Balls Ferry Wetland Unit 1 (BFW1) is located between Venzke Road and Balls Ferry Road, approximately one half mile north of the Cottonwood Creek Unit.</li> <li>• The 141-acre Balls Ferry Wetland Unit 2 (BFW2) consists of three parcels, one is located adjacent to the northwestern section of BFW1, one is immediately north across Balls Ferry Road, and the third is east of Webb Road.</li> </ul> The three units that comprise the MCCWA are all located in Township 29N, Range 3 W on the Balls Ferry USGS 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle map, in Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 32, and 33.
5.	<b>Project sponsor's name and address:</b> California Department of Fish and Game, Northern Region 601 Locust Street, Redding, California 96001
6.	<b>General plan designation(s):</b> Unclassified Agricultural Cropland and Grazing (A-cg) Natural Resource Protection Open Space (NO) Interim Mineral Resource (IMR)
7.	<b>Zoning:</b> Shasta County Parcels: Unclassified, Limited agriculture, Habitat protection-Interim mineral resource, Limited residential. Tehama County (1 parcel): Exclusive agriculture

RECEIVED

DEC - 6 2010

STATE CLEARING HOUSE

8.

**Description of project:**

*(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)*

This project is a draft Land Management Plan (LMP) for the MCCWA, an area owned by the State of California Department of Fish and Game. The purpose of Wildlife Areas is to protect, maintain, enhance or restore wildlife habitat, and to provide compatible wildlife-related recreational uses. Fish and Game Code sections (550-551) guide management of wildlife areas. The MCCWA contains three units: the Cottonwood Creek Unit and two Balls Ferry Wetland Units. CDFG acquired the Cottonwood Creek Unit over several years between 1981 and 1989. CDFG acquired the Balls Ferry Wetland Unit 1 in 2004 and Balls Ferry Wetland Unit 2 in 2008.

The LMP is an ecosystem-based adaptive management plan that describes the dynamic ecological conditions and managerial goals of the MCCWA. Written for a wide range of audiences with varying degrees of expertise in ecosystem level and adaptive management techniques, the LMP is a living document. As area managers gather more information and data, they will update the LMP and management goals will be refined and adapted. The LMP consists of 6 chapters and several appendices:

- I. Introduction
- II. Property Description
- III. Habitats and Species
- IV. Management Goals
- V. Operations and Maintenance
- VI. References

The LMP contains a description of the MCCWA and its environment as well as an evaluation of compatible wildlife-related public uses. The LMP also includes a conceptual plan for the Balls Ferry Research and Education Center on the Balls Ferry Wetland Unit 1.

This Initial Study considers the whole of the project, and as such, this project and Negative Declaration include the following components:

- The ongoing operation of the MCCWA, including the public uses incorporated in this LMP;
- Maintenance activities (e.g., habitat management and agriculture) to sustain the biological communities that provide habitat for wildlife and fisheries resources;
- Installation of minor improvements, such as signs and trails that do not involve substantial physical disruption of the Wildlife Area;
- Restoration and enhancement of grasslands and riparian areas;
- Maintenance of the MCCWA improvements;
- Monitoring and educational activities as well as scientific research;
- Ongoing coordination with public agencies and private interests consistent with the goals of this LMP;
- Dissemination of public information regarding the MCCWA that may include hardcopy and online data as well as other media;
- Update to MCCWA regulations; and
- Enforcement of duly adopted laws and regulations.

	<p>This LMP serves as a general policy guide for the management of the MCCWA. It does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive physical changes to the Wildlife Area. Because potential physical changes to the MCCWA would be a part of subsequent projects that have yet to be conceived, designed, or funded, it is not possible to reasonably evaluate the impacts of any such projects. Any such subsequent projects will be subject to CEQA review and will be considered in light of the contents of the LMP and this Initial Study. If a subsequent project is not included within the scope of this LMP (i.e., specific goals and tasks), it will require appropriate analysis and documentation pursuant to CEQA when it is conceived and proposed for approval.</p>
9.	<p><b>Surrounding land uses and setting:</b>  <i>(briefly describe the project's surroundings)</i></p> <p>The Cottonwood Creek Unit is surrounded by rural residential housing and small ranches on the north and west, the Bureau of Land Management's Redding Island Recreation Area and the Sacramento River on the east, and by Cottonwood Creek on the south. Access to the Cottonwood Unit is from Adobe Road. Both Balls Ferry wetland units are surrounded by rural residential homes and small ranches. Balls Ferry Road, Venzke Road, and Webb Road provide access to the two Balls Ferry wetland units. Please also see the draft MCCWA LMP Chapters II (Property Description) and III (Habitat and Species Descriptions).</p>
10.	<p><b>Other public agencies whose approval is required:</b>  <i>(e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)</i></p> <p>None.</p>

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Green House Gas Emissions		Transportation/Traffic		Population / Housing
	Mineral Resources		Noise		
	Public Services		Recreation	X	None
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<b>X</b>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

	10/29/10
Signature	Date
Signature	Date

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

<b>I. AESTHETICS —</b> <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

**DISCUSSION:**

**a), b), d) No Impact.**

The proposed LMP's goals are based upon ecosystem integrity and include optimizing native vegetation, preserving existing agricultural practices and cultural resources, and the protection of natural visual resources. MCCWA is not within a state scenic highway, and the proposed LMP does not involve the construction of any new buildings or outdoor lighting. Therefore LMP adoption would not adversely affect scenic vistas, damage scenic resources or create adverse lighting that affects day or nighttime views in the area.

**c) Less Than Significant Impact.**

Implementation of some proposed LMP management tasks would involve minor modifications to the existing landscape (e.g., restoration or enhancement activities, signage, and access improvements). Designed to prevent unauthorized access, minimize erosion, protect and enhance natural habitats and improve wildlife area management, these activities would provide a net benefit for the MCCWA's aesthetic conditions. Furthermore, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES —</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

**DISCUSSION: a), b), Less Than Significant Impact**

The MCCWA is located in Shasta and Tehama County regions with prime farmland (the valley floor near the Sacramento River and its tributaries). The California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Project (FMMP) depicts the Cottonwood Creek Unit and the BFW1 as "Other Lands" (California Department of Conservation, FMMP 2006). The FMMP "Other Lands" category includes low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. It also includes vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres. The FMMP depicts BFW2 as Unique Farmland, indicating an area used for agricultural production within 4 years of the mapping project, but has lesser quality soils. Unique Farmland areas are usually irrigated (FMMP 2006). The parcels that make up the MCCWA were in agricultural production (grazing and hay production) prior to CDFG's ownership. Consistent with the Shasta County General Plan (2004), conversion of agricultural lands to wildlife habitat is not a conflicting use. Furthermore, none of the parcels are included in the Williamson Act and the LMP proposes no land use changes to either Units that would remove existing lands from agricultural production or convert farmland to non-agricultural use.

**c) No Impact**

CDFG's current mission is to manage California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats upon which they depend, for their ecological values and for the public's use and enjoyment. LMP tasks do not include the establishment of any facilities, structures, or land uses that would economically or physically preclude returning the land to cultivation in the future, if such a public policy decision were made. LMP implementation would maintain a mix of natural communities and agricultural lands on the property; therefore, it would not be cost prohibitive to return the Wildlife Area to its present condition. Returning the land to cultivation would require removing the native vegetation and implementing some soil preparation, which is similar to the requirements of the original clearing of habitat necessary to create farmed land decades ago. Some infrastructure, such as roads and drainage, is necessary for management and maintenance of agricultural lands as well as for natural communities.



<b>III. AIR QUALITY –</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <b>Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<b>DISCUSSION:</b>  <b>a), b), c), d), e) Less Than Significant Impact.</b>  The MCCWA is located in the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin (NSVAB), which is comprised of seven counties including Shasta and Tehama. The NSVAB's approximate measurements are 200 miles long in a north-south direction with a maximum width of 150 miles, although the valley floor averages only 50 miles. The Shasta and Tehama County Air Pollution Control Districts are responsible for local implementation of state and federal air quality standards within the MCCWA region.  The MCCWA LMP proposed goals and tasks will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the Districts air quality plans nor contribute significantly to any air quality violations. LMP implementation will not construct any stationary sources of criteria pollutants, nor add to mobile sources, therefore, will not contribute to increasing local levels of green house gas (GhG) emissions. Implementation of the goals and tasks of the LMP will most likely reduce GHG through habitat preservation, restoration and subsequent carbon sequestration. Although some proposed LMP management tasks could involve the use of construction equipment (e.g., continued operations and maintenance, restoration or enhancement activities) thus temporarily increasing equipment emissions, these would be short-term impacts and would not cause a considerable cumulative net increase of air pollutants. None of the proposed LMP's management tasks would create objectionable odors or substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to				

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X	

#### **DISCUSSION:**

**a), b), c), d) e), f) Less Than Significant Impact.**

The MCCWA is located in the Cottonwood Creek watershed and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED) Cottonwood Creek Ecological Management Zone. The area is a restoration priority for the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) Plan (for which CDFG is an implementing agency). The MCCWA provides potential habitat for 22 special-status and priority wildlife and fish species identified in the CALFED Multi-Species Conservation Strategy (MSCS), and the presence of potentially suitable habitat for 6

additional special-status wildlife and fish species. For more information, please see the draft MCCWA LMP Chapter III Habitat and Species Descriptions.

The MCCWA LMP is designed around an adaptive management concept. Baseline data collection, monitoring of key ecosystem functions (or indicators), completing focused research to obtain a better understanding, and staging implementation based on information gained are all central to the LMP's adaptive management process. The LMP compliments the strategic objectives and conservations measures identified in the CALFED ERP and MSCS. Its tasks and goals were developed in coordination with Shasta County's stream and oak conservation policies (Shasta County 2004), the California Wildlife Action Plan (CDFG 2005, 2007), the Riparian and Oak Woodland Bird Conservation Plans (Riparian Habitat Joint Venture (2004) and California Partners In Flight 2002), the Cottonwood Creek Watershed Assessment (CH2M Hill 2002), and the Cottonwood Creek Ecological Management Zone (CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Plan 2000). Such measures and coordination helps ensure that all actions comply with federal and state Endangered Species Acts (ESA and CESA) and other applicable regulations, local policies or ordinances aimed at the protection of special-status species and wildlife.

The LMP's goals and tasks provide guidance to CDFG management of the Wildlife Area for the benefit of the habitats and species found on the sites. Although some proposed LMP management tasks would have the potential for temporary construction impacts, these impacts would not be substantial because habitat preservation and enhancement are the LMP's primary goals. Wetland and riparian habitat resources are especially valued for wildlife and fish habitat and the LMP proposes no actions that will remove, fill or disrupt the hydrological conditions that maintain these resources. The LMP's restoration or enhancement activities will improve habitat connectivity and movement corridors for native species and improve wildlife nursery sites. Additionally, any of these activities would conform to regulatory requirements such as CDFG regulations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regulations, State Water Quality Control Board (SWQCB) regulations, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), and any applicable plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Furthermore, prior to Implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?			X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

**DISCUSSION:****a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant Impact.**

Although some proposed LMP management tasks may involve ground disturbance (e.g., ongoing operations and maintenance, and restoration or enhancement activities), the LMP includes requirements for cultural resource surveys prior to major ground disturbance (e.g., excavations below normal plow depths) at undisturbed sites, and consultation with a qualified archaeologist in the case of an inadvertent discovery. The State Historic Preservation Officer consultation required by the plan would identify and protect any historic resources prior to their demolition. Additionally, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

--	--	--	--	--

**DISCUSSION:**

Based upon a review of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Maps (California Geological Survey 2002), the project area is not on or near any active earthquake fault zones. Shasta County has a low level of historic seismic activity. In the past 120 years, earthquakes caused no substantial property damage or loss of life within or near Shasta County. According to regional probabilistic ground shaking hazard maps (California Geological Survey 2003), the project area is subject to a 20 to 30% increase in earthquake-induced ground acceleration forces for a 10% probability of being exceeded in 50 years, a low probability relative to other portions of California.

The nearest significant fault is the Quaternary Battle Creek Fault, an east/west-trending normal fault approximately 20 miles east of the site. The Battle Creek Fault is approximately 14 miles long, with an estimated slip rate of 0.5 mm/year. The last known movement of this fault appears to be over 400,000 years ago. The maximum credible earthquake on the Battle Creek Fault was estimated to be a Richter magnitude of 6.0 (California Geological Survey 2002).

**a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant Impact.**

Soil erosion is the process whereby soil materials are worn away and transported to another area by either wind or water. Rates of erosion can vary depending on the soil material and structure, placement and human activity. Some of the proposed LMP management tasks, including restoration and trail maintenance, will involve minimal ground disturbance, but these activities are designed to ultimately reduce or prevent soil erosion, and would be implemented using best management practices designed to minimize erosion and/or topsoil loss. Additionally, all activities would conform to regulatory requirements regarding soil erosion.

The potential for liquefaction depends on the duration and intensity of earthquake shaking, particle size distribution of the soil, density of the soil, and elevation of the groundwater. Areas at risk due to the effects of liquefaction are typified by a high groundwater table and underlying loose to medium-density granular sediments, particularly younger alluvium and artificial fill. MCCWA soil types are considered expansive but due to the area's low potential for seismic activity and relatively flat terrain it is not considered a high-risk area subject to landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence or liquefaction. Moreover, the proposed MCCWA LMP serves as a general policy guide for MCCWA management. It does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive physical changes to the Wildlife Area. With the exception of ongoing restoration and enhancement, and operations and maintenance activities, any substantive physical changes that are not currently approved will require subsequent authorizations. Thus, LMP goal and task implementation would not create a substantial risk to lives or property.

In addition, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164

would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

**e) No Impact.**

The MCCWA LMP does not include construction of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, nor would any be required as a result of LMP goal or task implementation.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

**DISCUSSION:****a), b), e), f) h) Less Than Significant Impact.**

Located in rural areas of Shasta and Tehama Counties, the MCCWA is located approximately 1.25 miles north of the Lake California private airstrip. There is an abandoned private airstrip and airplane hanger on the Balls Ferry Wetland Unit 1, but CDFG has no intent to utilize them as such. The MCCWA LMP is designed for the continued maintenance of a Wildlife Area, there are no activities proposed that would expose any airport personnel or nearby residents to a safety hazard. LMP implementation will not require the routine use of hazardous materials, nonetheless, it does contain goals and tasks for hazardous materials safety provisions and best management practices. Additionally, the LMP's fire management goals and tasks will decrease potential risks of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. For these reasons less than significant impacts are expected for hazardous materials handling or accidental release, including near an airport or the potential losses resulting from wildland fires.

To further minimize the potential for impacts, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

**c), d), g), No Impact.**

The Wildlife Area is not within a ¼ mile of a school and the MCCWA LMP goals and tasks include designing an emergency response plan consistent with similar plans for the area, therefore no school or emergency response related impacts will occur.

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

**Discussion:**

Shasta County has classified Cottonwood Creek and the area within 0.5 mi. of the Sacramento River as "Designated Floodway". Designated Floodways are considered special flood hazard zones due to floodwater velocity, potential debris and projectiles and erosion. Land uses within designated floodways need to minimize environmental impacts to riparian and wetland habitats, while protecting life and property (Shasta County 2004).

MCCWA's Cottonwood Creek Unit is bounded by the Sacramento River to the east and Cottonwood Creek to the south. At 350-400 feet above sea level, it is located entirely within the 100-year floodplain of the creek and the river. The precise location of the Unit's southern boundary has yet to be determined due to the meandering channel of Cottonwood Creek (Graham Mathews & Associates 2003). There are no existing structures located on the Cottonwood Creek Unit, therefore nothing that would impede flood flow.

The Balls Ferry Wetland Units 1 and 2 are located three-quarters of a mile to the north, surrounded by residential properties, and sit 410 to 420 feet above sea level. The Balls Ferry Units have several structures related to the former owner's ranches but are not in the designated flood zone for the Sacramento River.

**a), b), c), d), e), f), h), g), j) No Impact.**

The draft LMP serves as a general policy guide for MCCWA management. It does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive physical changes to the Wildlife Area. With the exception of ongoing restoration and enhancement, and



operations and maintenance activities, any substantive physical changes not currently approved will require subsequent authorizations. The MCCWA LMP management tasks do not utilize additional surface or groundwater resources, create or contribute to stormwater runoff, construct new buildings or impervious surfaces, nor alter existing risks of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

#### **i) Less Than Significant Impact.**

Unlike the Cottonwood Creek Unit, the BFW Units have existing structures that are not located in a 100-year flood plain. MCCWA LMP management goals and tasks include flood control measures and restoration tasks to minimize potential flooding. These measures would conform with regulatory requirements regarding erosion and sediment control, flooding, and water quality protection, and would be a net improvement to water quality.

Moreover, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>IX. LAND USE – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

#### **DISCUSSION:**

##### **a), b), c) No Impact.**

The draft MCCWA LMP would not require any physical changes to an established community, nor would implementation of any activity following LMP adoption physically divide an established community. The LMP has been developed in conformance with land management plans (e.g., general plans) for adjacent areas. The LMP goals provide for natural resource protection and preservation and require that any projects implemented following adoption of the proposed LMP conform to any habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans that may be applicable at that time. The LMP also outlines resource coordination opportunities between agencies and interested parties to facilitate communication and information sharing so that no conflicts will arise in the future. Based upon these provisions no impacts to land use will occur.

<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES –</b> <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X	
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X	
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b></p> <p><b>a), b), Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p> <p>The Shasta General Plan does not delineate the MCCWA as an important mineral resource area (Shasta County 2004). The MCCWA is located approximately 5 miles downstream of an existing gravel extraction site. Three parcels within the Cottonwood Unit are zoned for interim mineral resource extraction (Shasta County Planning Department 2007). Presently mineral extraction on the Wildlife Area is prohibited, as it conflicts with CDFG's current mission to manage for ecological values and wildlife-related public uses.</p> <p>The LMP serves as a general policy guide for MCCWA management. It does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive physical changes to the Wildlife Area. With the exception of ongoing restoration and enhancement, and operations and maintenance activities, any substantive physical changes that are not currently approved will require subsequent authorizations. Thus, no MCCWA LMP tasks establish facilities, structures, or land uses that would physically or economically preclude mineral extraction in the future, if such a public policy decision were made and any potential mineral resource impacts are less than significant.</p>				
<b>XI. NOISE –</b> <b>Would the project result in:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in			X	

ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

### DISCUSSION:

#### a), b), c), d) e), f), Less Than Significant Impact.

Two waterways and a federal recreation site geographically border the Cottonwood Creek Unit, and the MCCWA is located in an area of low-density rural residential and agricultural use. The Lake California private airpark is located approximately 1.25 miles from the southernmost boundary of the Wildlife area. Although some proposed LMP management tasks could involve the intermittent use of construction equipment (e.g., restoration, enhancement or maintenance activities) thus temporarily increasing ambient noise, these activities would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels above those generated by the Wildlife Area's existing management practices or public uses. Since any increase in ambient noise will be temporary, and due to the isolated nature of the area, people in the vicinity will not be exposed to excessive noise levels or significantly impacted.

Furthermore, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

**DISCUSSION:****a), b), c). No Impact.**

The proposed LMP does not involve any change in housing nor would it induce growth through new infrastructure or by removing of any barriers to growth. Management goal and task implementation may require additional staff hours, but this would not induce population growth that would require additional housing.

<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

**DISCUSSION:****a) Less Than Significant Impact.**

Adoption of the proposed LMP would not require substantial changes to existing levels of public service. Implementation of public use, facilities, and fire management goals could require a minimal increase in staff hours per year by the fire department, the County Sheriff's department, and CDFG staff, but these potential minimal increases do not create the need for new or altered facilities.

Additionally, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>XIV. RECREATION – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b></p> <p><b>a), b) Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p> <p>The MCCWA's overall recreation goal is to provide a variety of public uses to the extent that such uses do not have significant adverse impacts on biological resources. The Cottonwood Creek Unit allows public entry one hour before sunrise to one hour after sunset. Access to the BFW1 is by permit only. BFW2 is currently closed to the public due to management considerations. Suitable recreational activities for the MCCWA are those that are either wildlife dependent or related and have low to moderate potential to negatively affect wildlife or conflict with other uses. Proposed MCCWA LMP adoption and implementation does not expand the Wildlife Area or change existing levels of wildlife-dependent recreational use. The existing use restrictions, coupled with the remoteness of the location and its limited access ensure the number of recreational users will not exceed the carrying capacity of its natural resources or degrade existing natural features or recreational facilities.</p> <p>Moreover, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.</p>				
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)			X	
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b></p> <p><b>a), b), c), d), e), f), g) Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p> <p>There are no predicted increases in MCCWA use levels (including automotive, boat or air traffic levels) following LMP adoption. No design changes are proposed for current road access, nor are any changes anticipated with traffic patterns; therefore, no traffic hazards are anticipated. Since changes to current traffic levels or patterns are not anticipated, no changes to emergency access or parking would result from plan adoption, and the plan would not interfere with alternative transportation.</p> <p>In addition, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.</p>				
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and			X	

regulations related to solid waste?				
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

**DISCUSSION:****a), b), c), d), e), f), g) Less Than Significant Impact.**

Anticipated levels of use at the MCCWA will remain the same following LMP adoption. The LMP does not include a proposal for additional storm drain, water supply, wastewater treatment, or solid waste disposal facilities. Proposed LMP adoption and goal and task implementation would not require the construction of new residences or service-related facilities; and therefore, would not generate a new demand or change existing capacities for storm water, water supply wastewater treatment, or solid waste disposal.

Additionally, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>XVII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment ?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases ?			X	

**DISCUSSION a), b) Less Than Significant Impact**

The MCCWA is located in the Northern Sacramento Valley Air Basin (NSVAB), which is comprised of seven counties including Shasta and Tehama. The NSVAB's approximate measurements are 200 miles long in a north-south direction with a maximum width of 150 miles, although the valley floor averages only 50 miles. The Shasta and Tehama County Air Pollution Control Districts are responsible for local implementation of state and federal air quality standards within the MCCWA region.

The MCCWA LMP proposed goals and tasks will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the Districts air quality plans nor contribute significantly to any air quality violations. LMP implementation will not construct any stationary sources of criteria pollutants, nor add to mobile sources, therefore, will not contribute to increasing local levels of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Implementation of the goals and tasks of the LMP will most likely reduce GHG through habitat preservation, restoration and subsequent carbon

sequestration. Although some proposed LMP management tasks could involve the use of construction equipment (e.g., continued operations and maintenance, restoration or enhancement activities) thus temporarily increasing equipment emissions, these would be short-term impacts and would not cause a considerable cumulative net increase of air pollutants. There are no predicted increases in MCCWA use levels (including automotive, boat or air traffic levels) following LMP adoption. No design changes are proposed for current road access, nor are any changes anticipated with traffic patterns. Hence, it is not expected to have a substantial increase in overall vehicle miles traveled by administrative personnel or the public. The MCCWA LMP management tasks do not utilize additional surface or groundwater resources and integrates many of the actions outlined in an internal policy referenced as "DFG Going Green – Reducing Our Carbon Footprint". Overall, the MCCWA LMP does not conflict with the Department's overall undertaking of reducing GHG emissions as part of its compliance within the Natural Resources Agency's adherence to Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 97.

In addition, prior to Implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to the recent CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 and 15168 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

<b>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –</b> <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

--



**DISCUSSION:****a) Less Than Significant Impact.**

LMP goal and task implementation would help preserve and enhance the natural resources of the MCCWA. As described in Chapter IV and V of the MCCWA LMP, there are some restoration and enhancement activities that could potentially impact biological and cultural resources. However, there are no significant impacts anticipated to these resources because these activities would follow all applicable regulatory requirements and the LMP goals and tasks are designed to have a net benefit to these resources. Additionally, no large scale projects are anticipated which could threaten entire populations or communities.

Moreover, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed

**b) Less Than Significant Impact.**

LMP adoption and goal and task implementation would not require any substantial infrastructure improvements or new construction, and any implementation activities conducted would follow all applicable regulatory requirements. In addition, the proposed goals and tasks are designed to provide a net benefit to environmental conditions. Therefore, although there is a potential for some temporary and less than significant impacts to the environment as described above, none of these impacts are cumulatively considerable.

In addition, prior to implementation of projects consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, to determine if additional CEQA documentation is necessary. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164 would guide the type of additional CEQA review to be completed.

**c) Less Than Significant Impact.**

CDFG's current mission is to manage California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats upon which they depend, for their ecological values and for the public's use and enjoyment. The proposed project is an LMP that serves as a general policy guide for the management of the MCCWA. It does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive physical changes to the Wildlife Area. With no substantive physical changes proposed, LMP implementation will comply with all applicable laws and regulations. As a result, LMP goal and task implementation would not have any direct or indirect environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

## REFERENCES:

- California Department of Conservation. 2006. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Online: <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/Pages/Index.aspx>
- Cal-Fed Bay Delta Program. 2000. Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration, Final Programmatic EIR/EIS Technical Appendix. Online: [http://calwater.ca.gov/content/Documents/ERPP\\_Vol\\_3.pdf](http://calwater.ca.gov/content/Documents/ERPP_Vol_3.pdf)
- CalPIF (California Partners in Flight). 2002. Version 2.0. The oak woodland bird conservation plan: a strategy for protecting and managing oak woodland habitats and associated birds in California (S. Zack, lead author). Point Reyes Bird Observatory, Stinson Beach, CA. <http://www.prbo.org/calpif/plans.html>
- California Geological Survey. 2002. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Maps. Online: <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/ap/Pages/index.aspx>
- Cao, T., W.A. Bryant, B.R. Rowshandel, D. Branum, D. and C.J. Wills. 2003. The Revised 2002 California Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Maps. California Geological Survey.
- CH2M Hill. 2002. Cottonwood Creek Watershed Assessment. Prepared for the Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group. Online: <http://www.ccwgrp.org/ccwa.html>
- CH2M Hill. 2007. Cottonwood Creek Watershed Management Plan. Prepared for the Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group. Online: <http://www.ccwgrp.org/ccwmp.html>
- Graham Mathews and Associates. 2003. Hydrology, Geomorphology, and Historic Channel Changes of Lower Cottonwood Creek, Shasta and Tehama Counties, California. CALFED Bay-Delta Program Project # 97-N07. Online: [http://www.cottonwoodcreekwatershed.org/nodes/aboutwatershed/reports/documents/hq\\_hcc\\_toc.pdf](http://www.cottonwoodcreekwatershed.org/nodes/aboutwatershed/reports/documents/hq_hcc_toc.pdf)
- Lade, P. and J. A. Yamamuro (Eds). 1999. Physics and Mechanics of Soil Liquefaction. A.A. Balkema Publishers: Rotterdam, Netherlands.
- Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area. 2006 Air Quality Attainment Plan. Online: <http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/departments/resourcemanagement/drm/pdf/Attainment%20Plan%202006.pdf>
- Riparian Habitat Joint Venture. 2004. The riparian bird conservation plan: a strategy for reversing the decline of riparian associated birds in California. California Partners in Flight. [http://www.prbo.org/calpif/pdfs/riparian\\_v-2.pdf](http://www.prbo.org/calpif/pdfs/riparian_v-2.pdf)
- Shasta County. 2004. General Plan. Online: [http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/Departments/Resourcemanagement/drm/general\\_plan.htm](http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/Departments/Resourcemanagement/drm/general_plan.htm)
- Shasta County. 2007. Shasta County Interactive GIS database. Online: [http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/html/GIS/gis\\_index.htm](http://www.co.shasta.ca.us/html/GIS/gis_index.htm)
- UC Davis Wildlife Health Center. 2005. California Wildlife Conservation Challenges: California Wildlife Action Plan. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game. Online: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/WAP/docs/report/full-report.pdf>
- USDA. Natural Resource Conservation Service. 1996. Soil Quality Resource Concerns: Soil Erosion. Online: [http://soils.usda.gov/sqi/publications/files/sq\\_two\\_1.pdf](http://soils.usda.gov/sqi/publications/files/sq_two_1.pdf)